

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

## Media framing of spiders may exacerbate arachnophobic sentiments

### This is the author's manuscript

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1754693> since 2023-01-26T13:59:35Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1002/pan3.10143

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

# Media framing of spiders may exacerbate arachnophobic sentiments

Stefano Mammola<sup>1,2,\*\*</sup>, Veronica Nanni<sup>3</sup>, Paolo Pantini<sup>4</sup>, Marco Isaia<sup>5,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Molecular Ecology Group (MEG), Water Research Institute, National Research Council of Italy (CNR-IRSA), Largo Tonolli 50, 28922 Verbania Pallanza, Italy

<sup>2</sup> Laboratory for Integrative Biodiversity Research (LIBRe), Finnish Museum of Natural History (LUOMUS), University of Helsinki, Pohjoinen Rautatiekatu 13, 00100 Helsinki, Finland

<sup>3</sup> Department of Earth, Environmental and Life Science (DISTAV), University of Genoa, Via Balbi 5, 16126 Genova, Italy

<sup>4</sup> Museo civico di Scienze Naturali “E. Caffi”, Piazza Cittadella 10, 24129, Bergamo, Italy

<sup>5</sup> Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, University of Turin, Via Accademia Albertina 13, 10123 Torino, Italy

\* corresponding author: [marco.isaia@unito.it](mailto:marco.isaia@unito.it)

\*\* 2<sup>nd</sup> corresponding author: [stefano.mammola@cnr.it](mailto:stefano.mammola@cnr.it)

## ABSTRACT

1. Spiders are able to arouse strong emotional reactions in humans. While spider bites are statistically rare events, our perception is skewed towards the potential harm spiders can cause to humans. Nevertheless, there is still limited understanding of the role of the media in spreading (mis)information about them thereby promoting this distorted perception of risk.

2. We examined the human dimension of spiders through the lens of traditional media, by analysing spider-related news published online in Italian newspapers between 2010 and 2020 (n= 314). We assessed the accuracy, circulation, and sensationalistic content of each article, and assessed how each of these features drove news' share on social media.

3. We observed a recent, exponential increase in the frequency of the news, particularly those focused on medically important spiders – the Mediterranean black widow (*Latrodectus tredecimguttatus*) and the Mediterranean recluse (*Loxosceles rufescens*). The news quality was generally poor: 70% contained different types of error, 32% were sensationalistic, and in virtually none was an expert consulted.

4. The risk scenario depicted by the media reports was unnecessarily alarmist, especially with regard to *Loxosceles rufescens*. A conservative estimate would suggest that less than 10% of the bites reported in the media reports analysed here were delivered by the species described in the report. Moreover, two out of three casualties associated with a bite of the Mediterranean recluse were fake news, while the third was unverifiable.

5. Overstated news referring to spider bites were significantly more shared on social media, thus contributing to frame a distorted perception of the risk. This is important given that these negative

sentiments may ultimately lead to lowering public tolerance towards spiders and reducing conservation efforts towards them. We discuss open questions and avenues for future research concerning the media coverage of widely feared animals, that will help bridging knowledge gaps regarding the role of traditional and social media in framing our perception of the natural world.

**Keywords:** Arachnophobia; Black widows; Emotional contagion; Envenomation; Facebook; Fake news; Latrodectism; Loxoscelism; Mass media, Recluse spiders; Social media; Spider bite

## SECOND LANGUAGE ABSTRACT

1. I ragni sono organismi in grado di suscitare forti reazioni emotive. Sebbene i loro morsi siano eventi statisticamente rari, esiste una diffusa paura riguardo ai ragni anche in aree del pianeta dove non sono presenti specie pericolose per l'uomo. Tale percezione distorta del rischio potrebbe essere in parte dovuta alla diffusione mediatica di informazioni imprecise sui ragni.

2. Abbiamo indagato questo fenomeno in Italia, andando a valutare la correttezza, la diffusione e il contenuto sensazionalistico di più di 300 notizie pubblicate su giornali e riviste online tra il 2010 e il 2020. Per ogni articolo, abbiamo stimato statisticamente come ciascuno di questi fattori agisca sulla diffusione delle notizie sui *social media* (Facebook).

3. Vi è stato un recente aumento nella frequenza di notizie sui ragni in Italia, specialmente quelle incentrate sulle due specie di rilevanza medica in Italia - la vedova nera mediterranea (*Latrodectus tredecimguttatus*) ed il ragno violino (*Loxosceles rufescens*). L'attendibilità delle notizie è risultata generalmente bassa: il 70% conteneva diversi tipi di errori, il 32% era di carattere sensazionalistico e quasi in nessun caso era stato consultato un esperto.

4. Una significativa porzione degli articoli forniva una rappresentazione allarmistica e distorta del rischio associato ai morsi di ragni, soprattutto nel caso del ragno violino. Una stima prudente suggerirebbe come meno del 10% dei morsi riportati negli articoli siano effettivamente attribuibili alle specie menzionate. Inoltre, le sporadiche notizie inerenti morsi fatali di ragno violino erano o false o non verificabili.

5. Le notizie a carattere sensazionalistico erano, inoltre, maggiormente condivise sui *social media*, contribuendo così a generare una percezione distorta del rischio associato ai morsi di ragno. Sul lungo periodo, questo fenomeno potrebbe portare ad un'ulteriore stigmatizzazione dei ragni ed ad una riduzione degli sforzi di conservazione nei loro confronti. Il nostro lavoro apre la strada a future ricerche riguardanti la copertura mediatica di animali ritenuti pericolosi, andando a disvelare il ruolo che i media svolgono nella nostra percezione del mondo naturale.

## INTRODUCTION

Wildlife is an important emotional trigger in humans (Jacobs, 2009, 2012; Hicks & Stewart, 2018). Admiration and respect, surprise and excitement, but also fear and disgust are just a few examples illustrating the spectrum of emotions reported by people experiencing encounters with wildlife (Hicks & Stewart, 2018). Studies suggest that these emotional feelings toward wildlife are in-born (Strommen, 1995; Davey et al., 1998; Prokop & Tunnicliffe, 2008; DeLoache, Pickard, & LoBue, 2010), often recurring with striking similarities across diverse

cultural settings (Davey et al., 1998). As a direct consequence, animal-related emotions end up playing a key role in scientific and socio-political debates around both the management and conservation of wildlife (Jones, 2006; Singh, 2009; Frank, Johansson, & Flykt, 2015; Zainal Abidin & Jacobs, 2019; Drijfhout, Kendal, & Green, 2020; Straka, Miller, & Jacobs, 2020), and in the perception of risk (Knopff, Knopff, & St. Clair, 2016; Hathaway et al., 2017; Bombieri et al., 2018; Nanni et al., 2020).

Spiders are iconic examples of animals that can bring about strong emotional reactions in humans (Michalski & Michalski, 2010; Lemelin & Yen, 2015; Hauke & Herzig, 2017; Mammola, Michalik, Hebets, & Isaia, 2017), leading to a distorted perception of risk, especially when referring to spider bites. While less than 0.5% of spider species are capable of causing severe envenomation in humans (Hauke & Herzig, 2017), and no proven fatality due to spider bites have occurred in the past few decades (Nentwig & Kuhn-Nentwig, 2013; Nntwig, Gnädinger, Fuchs, & Ceschi, 2013; Stuber & Nentwig, 2016), the perception of the risk associated with spider bites remains skewed towards the potential harm spiders can cause in humans (Hauke & Herzig, 2017). These feelings seemingly find their psychological roots in our ancestral fear of venomous animals (Knight, 2008; Gerdes, Uhl, & Alpers, 2009), but might also have a cultural component (Davey, 1994; Merckelbach, Muris, & Schouten, 1996; Davey et al., 1998). As Cavell (2018, p. 2) nicely put it “... *one of the most remarkable aspects of modern human-spider relations is the prevalence of arachnophobia in places with few or no highly dangerous spider species*”. Indeed, even though human-spider encounters are frequent events because spiders are omnipresent in all terrestrial ecosystems (Turnbull, 1973), including indoor environments (Bertone et al., 2016), the objective risk of being bitten by a harmful spider is minimal in most areas of the world (Diaz & Leblanc, 2007). These considerations raise the questions of why such a skewed perception of risk persists in modern societies (Lemelin & Yen, 2015).

It is known that humans have the tendency to evaluate risk through feelings and emotions rather than objectively (Slovic & Peters, 2006), often overestimating the frequency of statistically rare events. For example, many people fear flying, even though the casualties associated with civil flights are estimated to be in the order of 0.07 deaths per billion passenger miles (Savage, 2013). The same line of reasoning can be applied to people’s risk judgments of low probability events related to wildlife, such as being attacked by a large carnivore (Bombieri et al., 2018) or stung or bitten by a venomous animal (Langley, 2005). Furthermore, a distorted perception of risk can be exacerbated by the way in which information is framed in the scientific literature (Bennett & Vetter, 2004; Stuber & Nentwig, 2016) or in traditional media sources (Gerber, Burton-Jeangros, & Dubied, 2011).

As far as spiders are concerned, it has been demonstrated that there is a significant overdiagnosis of spider bites and envenomation in the medical literature (White, 2003; Bennett & Vetter, 2004; Vetter, 2004; Vetter et al., 2005; Vetter, Hinkle, & Ames, 2009; Stuber & Nentwig, 2016). A recent major role in spreading falsehoods about spiders could also be associated with traditional and social media, due to their high efficiency in conveying a

message more directly and reaching a wider audience (Vosoughi, Roy, & Aral, 2018). It is understood how the media play an important role in the construction and circulation of risk images associated with animals, contributing to develop fears and ambivalence (Gerber et al., 2011). Yet, while spiders are the quintessential feared animals, there is still poor understanding of the role of the media in spreading (mis)information about them (Cushing & Markwell, 2010).

Here, we explored the human dimension of spiders in Italy through the lens of traditional and social media. We examined the media representations of human-spider encounters as published in Italian online newspapers over the past 10 years, in order to assess the accuracy, spreading, and sensationalistic content of news. We tackled the following questions:

- i) What is the content and quality of the information of each spider-related media report?
- ii) What is the temporal distribution of spider-related news?
- iii) Which factors determine the effective spreading of news on social media?

Our over-arching goal is to understand the potential role of online media in exacerbating arachnophobic sentiments and promoting a distorted perception of the risk associated with

spider bites. This is important given that these negative sentiments may ultimately lead to lowering public tolerance towards spiders and reducing conservation efforts towards them (Knight, 2008; Simaika & Samways, 2018).

## **METHODS**

### **Media report search**

We adapted the methodology of Bombieri et al. (2018) for retrieving media reports on human-spider encounters published in Italian online newspapers (Figure 1a). We carried out online searches in Italian with *Google news*, choosing multiple keyword combinations. We first searched for the Italian words for bite (“morso”), followed by spider (“ragno”) and one of the years between 2010 and 2020 (e.g., “morso ragno 2014”). We repeated the search using the word sting (“puntura”) instead of bite, given that it is frequently used (incorrectly) by journalists (among others; see, e.g., Afshari, 2016). We then repeated the search, changing the noun “ragno” (spider) to the Latin and vernacular names of spider species generally perceived as dangerous in Italy (Box 1): *Cheiracanthium punctarium* (“Ragno dal sacco giallo”), *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* (“Argia”, “Malmignatta”, “Vedova nera”), *Loxosceles rufescens* (“Reclusa”, “Ragno eremita”, “Ragno violino”), and *Zoropsis spinimana* (“Falsa lica”). We compiled the list of species based on our experience in years of interaction with the staff of the Anti-poison Center in Milan (Centro Antiveleni) and the San Giovanni Molinette hospital in Turin, who regularly contacted us asking for expert opinions on spider identification (on average 4.6 requests/month in 2019).

This search strategy led to a total of 260 searches: 2 actions (“morso” or “puntura”) x 13 species names (the general words “ragno”, 4 Latin, and 8 vernacular species names) x 10 years (2010–2020). For each unique keyword search, we checked news up to the final available page in *Google news*, collecting all the media reports referring to one or more encounters in Italy between humans and spiders. We disregarded: i) media reports which did not mention a specific locality for the event; ii) media reports referring to spider bite events that occurred outside Italy (e.g., a report written in Italian but focusing on a spider bite that occurred in England); and iii) media reports not specifically reporting a spider-human encounter (e.g., news discussing best practices to deal with a spider bite).

### **Media report content**

For each media report, we first extracted basic information: a) title, b) date of publication, c) journal name, and d) journal circulation (‘Regional’ or ‘National’). We classified newspapers circulation as ‘Regional’ if their total circulation was below 50,000 copies and as ‘National’ if it was above 50,000 copies, using the 2017 Assessment for Press Circulation provided by the society Accertamenti Diffusione Stampa (ADS) srl. Whenever newspapers were not covered in this report, we used the information found on each newspaper’s webpage.

Then we read the full article and scored the e) spider species as it was mentioned in the media report (even if the species attribution was incorrect based on indirect evidence), f) type of event (“encounter”, “bite”, or “deadly bite”), g) year of the event, h) location of the event, i) presence/absence of photographs of the spider, j) presence/absence of photographs of the bite, and k) possible mention of an expert-opinion (doctor, arachnologist, or general biologist). Since several media reports were discussing the same event, we created an identifier for each unique event (ID), by combining location and year of the event (e.g., “Terni\_2018”). We also derived WGS84 coordinates for each event location, by geo-referencing the nearest city on *Google Earth*.

Following Nanni et al. (2020), we expressed the success of each media report as its spreading on social media, using the number of total shares in Facebook. We chose Facebook, as it is one of the most used social media platforms in Social Science research (e.g., Wilson, Gosling, & Graham, 2012; Kramer, Guillory, & Hancock, 2014). We extracted Facebook shares using the API tool available on ShareCount webpage ([www.sharedcount.com](http://www.sharedcount.com); accessed on 2 March 2020). When the number of shares exceeds 999, this tool returns a rounded number (e.g., 1K for number of shares between 1000 and 1999). In such cases, we used the lowest number (1000). Even though we compared the number of shares for media reports published in different years, we consider this a reliable approach (see Nanni et al., 2020). Indeed, the share of online news on social media typically reaches a stable plateau at 30 days after publication (Papworth et al., 2015).

### **Scientific quality of the media reports**

We assessed the quality of each media report by checking for the presence/absence of four types of errors in text and figures:

- i) errors in photographs, when the photograph(s) of the species in the media report (if any) did not correspond to the species mentioned in the text, or when the attribution was not possible (e.g., blurry photographs);
- ii) errors in systematics and taxonomy, like the common mistake of considering spiders “insects” (Jambrina, Vacas, & Sánchez-Barbudo, 2010), but also subtle inaccuracies in term of Linnaean taxonomic ranks [e.g., ID 271 (translated): “... the ‘*malmignatta*’, a *genus* of Italian spider belonging to the *family* of the *species* of the *black widow*”];
- iii) errors in venom and other physiological or medical aspects or terminology [e.g., ID 147 (translated): “... the *venom sac* was removed with surgery”]; and
- iv) errors in morphology and anatomy, such as the frequent “spider sting” instead of “spider bite” (Afshari, 2016).

Each error type was scored as present or absent, thus we did not counted cumulative errors of the same type in the same report.

### **Classification of Sensationalism**

Three authors (MI, SM, and VN) independently evaluated the title, subheadings, and main text of each media report, and assessed it as overstated (sensationalistic) or not (neutral). We took the consensus between the three independent evaluations to minimize the effect of subjectivity. Sensationalism in animal-related media reports is often associated with emotional words and expressions (Bombieri et al., 2018; Nanni et al., 2020). In our case, frequent words associated with sensationalistic content were alarm (“allarme”), agony (“agonia”), attack (“attacco”), devil (“diavolo”), fear (“paura”), hell (“inferno”), killer (“assassino”), nightmare (“incubo”), panic (“panico”), terrible (“terribile”), and terror (“terrore”). Examples of titles (literally translated from Italian) of sensationalistic versus non sensationalistic media reports focusing on the same event are, respectively: i) “[...] Sardinia and the nightmare of venomous spiders” versus “Black widow spider spotted in Sardinia, but the expert is happy: it is an indicator of biodiversity”; ii) “Alarm in Rome: Violin spiders strike again and again. Boom of hospitalisations” versus “Bitten by a violin spider, he was immediately hospitalized”; or iii) “Attacked by a violin spider, traffic warden miraculously survived” versus “Be aware of the violin spider: if it bites you, it can be dangerous”.

### **Data analysis**

We conducted all analyses in R (R Core Team, 2018). We graphically explored the content of media reports with barcharts and boxplots with ‘ggplot2’ (Wickham, 2016). For the two most abundant species, *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* and *Loxosceles rufescens*, we explored temporal distribution of media reports using density plot, by computing a kernel density estimate with a 1.5 bandwidth adjustment for both the annual and monthly distribution of

media reports (Wickham, 2016). For this and the following analysis, we excluded media reports published in 2020 given this year was covered only up to February.

We used generalized linear mixed models (GLMM) to explore the factors driving the share of news on Facebook. We followed Zuur & Ieno's (2016) protocol for presenting regression-type analyses, whereby we: i) conducted data exploration and identified the dependency structure in the data; ii) explained, fitted, and validated the regression models; and iii) interpreted the regression output and presented the main effect plots.

The data exploration revealed the presence of four outliers in the number of shares, namely media reports shared over 15,000 times on Facebook. We removed these four observation from the database. Furthermore, we observed that 39.5% of media reports were never shared on Facebook (Figure 2b). However, since these are "true zeros" (sensu Blasco-Moreno, Pérez-Casany, Puig, Morante, & Castells, 2019), we did not apply zero-inflated models.

We fitted GLMMs with 'glmmADMB' (Fournier et al., 2012), starting from an initial structure that included all covariates and random terms of interest:

Share ~ Event type + Circulation + Year + Month + Month<sup>2</sup> + Sensationalism + Species + Figure (species) + Figure (bite) + Expert opinion + random(Newspaper) + random(ID) (*Eq. 1*; in R notation)

The random factor 'Newspaper' was introduced because reports published in the same newspaper usually share a similar language, style, and graphical elements. The random factor 'ID' was introduced to take into account the fact that multiple reports in our dataset discussed the same events. We included the square of month (term month<sup>2</sup>) to capture a possible seasonal response of the shares during the year (i.e., a quadratic relationship between shares and month).

The numbers of Facebook shares are counts, so we initially chose a Poisson distribution. The Poisson GLMM was, however, highly over-dispersed ( $\chi^2$ : 227751553743;  $p < 0.001$ ) and so we switched to a negative binomial distribution. Once the initial model had been fitted, we performed a step-wise model selection in 'MuMIn' (Bartoń, 2019). We based the model reduction on Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Akaike weights [ $w_i(\text{AIC})$ ] (Burnham & Anderson, 2004), in order to simplify the model and avoid overfitting (Hawkins, 2004).

## RESULTS

### Content of media reports

We collected and analysed 314 media reports published between 2010 and 2020, discussing 344 spider-related events attributable to 97 unique events (Figure 1b). The database with the analysed media reports is available in Figshare (Mammola et al., 2020a). The average ( $\pm$ s.d.) number of media reports discussing each event was  $3.52 \pm 6.72$  (range 1–33). The two most discussed events were i) the story of a traffic warden from Terni who was supposedly bitten by a Mediterranean recluse spider in 2018, covered by 33 media reports; and ii) the story of a



woman supposedly bitten in 2019 by a Mediterranean recluse spider while sunbathing in Collecchio, covered by 31 media reports. All other events were covered by 20 media reports or fewer.

Most media reports focused on *Loxosceles rufescens* (n= 230; 66.9%) and *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* (n= 97; 27.3%) (see Box 1 for a brief account on these species). Other species – *Cheiracanthium punctatorium* (n= 14), *Steatoda* sp. (n= 4), and unidentified (n= 2) – were poorly represented (5.8%) and so we merged these under the category “Others”. Reports on *La. tredecimguttatus* mostly discussed human-spider encounters (Figure 2a), e.g., a farmer spotting a black widow while working in his field or a tourist photographing the species during a hike. Conversely, reports on *Lo. rufescens* mostly referred to bites (real or otherwise), including three unverified fatal cases (see below). Most media reports contained one or more photographs of the species (n= 298; 86.6%; Figure 2c), whereas only ca. 10% of media reports contained photographs of the bite (n= 33) (Figure 2d). Expert were sporadically mentioned in media reports (Figure 2e) and sensationalistic contents were more frequent in media reports referring to *Lo. rufescens* rather than other species (Figure 2f).

The three casualties associated with a bite by *Lo. rufescens* reported in the media reports were unverifiable. The only scientifically supported fatality refers to a case of loxoscelism in a woman, 65, dating back to 2015. This event was discussed in the medical literature (Pezzi et al., 2016), and was later mentioned by seven media reports. However, the reliability of the medical report was readily questioned by Nentwig et al. (2017), because the identity of the spider biting the woman was not ascertained. Allegedly: “[The woman] was bitten the evening before hospitalization while cleaning the home cellar by a spider; which, from the description and place where the bite occurred, could probably be identified as the *Loxosceles rufescens* species” (Pezzi et al., 2016). Two other fatalities covered in the media reports – Cagliari (2017) and Aosta (2020) – are unverifiable, and most likely wrong, given that neither was the bite ascertained nor was the spider collected and identified. The validity of these reports was even questioned in some newspapers, for example ID 229 stating that “The story of the men who died due to a violin spider bite is probably fake news”, or ID 115 observing that “... he died three months after being stung [bitten] by a violin spider. But the cause of his death could be another” (titles literally translated).

### Quality of media reports

One or more error types were present in 73% of media reports (Figure 3). The distribution of errors varied, however, depending on the species: most media reports referring to *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* and other species contained no errors, whereas most reports on *Loxosceles rufescens* contained one or more errors (Figure 3a). The most frequent errors referred to spider morphology and anatomy (55.3%), species photographs (28.4%), and systematics and taxonomy (25.8%). Errors referring to venom and other physiological aspects were present in 15% of media reports (Figure 3b–e).

## Temporal distribution of media reports

We observed a strong temporal signal in the distribution of media reports between 2010 and 2019, with a recent increase in the number of news for both species, which was rather steadily increasing in *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* and almost exponential in *Loxosceles rufescens* (Figure 4a). In particular, *Lo. rufescens* began appearing in the media spotlight in the past five years (Figure 4a). The increase of reports focusing on this species, often of poor quality (Figure 3a) and with highly sensationalistic content (Figure 2f), started just after the publication of the first supposed case of fatal loxoscelism in Europe (Pezzi et al., 2016). Coincidentally, this increase also came after the publication in Italy of *Quand sort la recluse*, a crime novel by Fred Vargas, where Chief inspector Jean-Batiste Adamsberg has to deal with a series of murders committed using the venom of *Lo. rufescens*. While there is probably no causal relationship between these events and the increase in number of reports, it is interesting to note that several recent media reports in our database referenced both sources.

From a seasonal point of view (Figure 4b), we found that there was a clear summer peak, in July, in the frequency of reports for both species. This seasonal pattern was more evident for reports referring to *La. tredecimguttatus*.

## Factors affecting the sharing of media reports on social media

The model that minimized AIC included year and sensationalism as fixed terms (Table 1). Random effect variance ( $\pm$  s.e.) was  $6.55 \pm 3.56$  for Newspaper and  $3.24 \times 10^{-5} \pm 0.01$  for Event\_ID. We found a significant positive effect of the year of publication, with recent media reports being, on average, more frequently shared on social media (Figure 5a). Furthermore, media reports with sensationalistic content were, on average, more frequently shared on social media (Figure 5b). All other factors had no significant influence on sharing on social media, and were discarded during model selection (Table 1).

## DISCUSSION

### Content of media reports and temporal distribution

We found that the scientific quality of online newspaper articles focusing on spiders in Italy is, in general, rather poor, independently of the newspaper's circulation (national versus regional). Over 70% of media reports contained errors, 32% were characterized by a sensationalistic content, and in virtually none of them was an expert consulted or interviewed. Despite our analysis does not allow any direct interpretation about the factors determining the prevalence of errors, it seems likely that journalists, maybe due to stringent deadlines, do not invest time in documenting their cases accurately, resulting in texts written quickly and not carefully. Providing the photo of a wrong species, calling a spider "insect", or stating that a spider "stings" rather than "bites", are small errors that contribute to spread misinformation or may have broader implications, such as for legal cases (e.g., US District Court, 2020).

The two most represented species in the media reports were *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* and *Loxosceles rufescens*, both widely distributed in Italy (Box 1). We found that the risk scenario depicted by the media reports with regard to *Lo. rufescens* was

unnecessarily alarmist. First, no proven fatality due to a bite by this species has occurred globally (Nentwig et al., 2017). Second, overdiagnosis of spider bites is a rather common phenomenon for “popular” taxa such as *Loxosceles* (Stuber & Nentwig, 2016). A conservative estimate would suggest that less than 10% of the bites reported in the media reports analysed here were delivered by the species described in the report (see Suchard, 2011). Third, in virtually none of the media reports is it written that the biting spider was brought to a hospital for identification, thus the causal attribution remains unconfirmed and merely suspected (Vetter & Isbister, 2008). Accordingly, the content of the majority of media reports analysed here has to be taken at best as anecdotic.

The quality of media reports referring to *La. tredecimguttatus* was better, and fewer reports had a sensationalistic content. The Mediterranean black widow began appearing in the media spotlight only in the past ten years (Figure 4a), with the highest number of media reports from late spring to early autumn, paralleling the period of highest activity of the species (Nentwig et al., 2020) and corresponding to the higher possibility of human-spider encounters. Given that most media reports on *La. tredecimguttatus* were in fact ‘Encounters’ (Figure 2a), namely reports of the species’ presence as provided by readers of the different newspapers, the distribution of news may be somehow tracking the species’ phenology, making it an unusual example of iEcology (Jarić et al., 2020). However, the higher prevalence of secondary news during the summer holidays may also partly be due to the well known trend in journalism whereby, in the absence of more relevant news, a secondary subject such as a spider bite is frequently able to make it to the front pages. Furthermore, the seasonal pattern in the distribution of news with a marked summer peak (Figure 4b), parallels what was found by Cushing & Markwell (2010) when analysing newspapers articles on the Australian endemic Sydney funnel-web spider (*Atrax robustus*).

### **Social media amplification of sensationalistic contents**

Social media have profoundly shaped the way the information is produced and circulated, including spider-related contents. We found that the share of news on social media has increased significantly in recent years (Figure 5a), but not all news on spiders were shared with the same frequency. While sensationalistic reports represent only about one third of the total media reports analysed in this survey, these were on average shared on Facebook two to three times more than neutral news (Figure 5b). This results is in accordance with general studies demonstrating that newspaper articles with content evoking strong positive or negative emotions are more likely to become viral (Berger & Milkman, 2012). Being shared on social media, sensationalistic news will inevitably be more widely read. Due to their sensationalistic content, they are also more likely to remain imprinted in a reader’s memory, especially in an arachnophobic reader’s, since it has been demonstrated that arachnophobics recall spider-relevant information more effectively (Smith-Janik & Teachman, 2008). On top of this, social media platforms are a fertile ground for emotional contagion, the phenomenon whereby emotional states are rapidly transferred to others leading to massive-scale emotional

homogenisation (Kramer et al., 2014). This may contribute to empowering a biased perception of risk (Gerber et al., 2011) and facilitate the persistence of arachnophobic sentiments.

### **Significance of results for spider conservation**

As demonstrated by Knight (2008), aesthetic and positive/negative features of animals correlate to the protection each taxon receives. Accordingly, the main challenges facing invertebrate conservationists is to change the perceived negative connotations of invertebrates by the public (Samways et al., 2020), raising awareness about the importance of these often uncharismatic organisms for the correct functioning of ecosystems (Cardoso et al., 2020). Spiders are apical predators in the invertebrate food web (Nyffeler & Birkhofer, 2017), while also representing a key source of food for other organisms, such as birds (Rogers, Hille Ris Lambers, Miller, & Tewksbury, 2012). The importance of spiders has been even valued in economic terms, given that many species act as major biocontrol for pests in agroecosystem (Cotes et al., 2018; Michalko, Pekar, & Entling, 2019; Michalko, Pekár, Dul'a, & Entling, 2019), and their body structures, silk, and venom are constant sources for bio-inspired materials and engineering solutions (Hinman, Jones, & Lewis, 2000; Heim, Keerl, & Scheibel, 2009; Kang et al., 2014), as well as pharmaceutical products (Saez et al., 2010; Moore, Leung, Norton, & Cochran, 2013). Nevertheless, spiders are still largely underrepresented in global and regional conservation policies, particularly when compared to vertebrates (Leather, 2013; Davies et al., 2018; Fukushima, Mammola, & Cardoso, 2020) or charismatic insects such as butterflies and dragonflies. In Europe, for example, spiders are almost entirely absent from international and national conservation policies (Mammola et al., 2020b), as well as from Italian legislation (Milano, Pantini, Mammola, & Isaia, 2017).

Traditional media have the potential to play an important role in changing the *status quo*, by offering the public unbiased representations of spiders. In fact, the traditional media arguably remain among the most powerful communication tools, capable of delivering their message effectively especially thanks to the aid of social media (Ju, Jeong, & Chyi, 2014). If this potential is harnessed to the goal of delivering accurate information to the public at large (Papworth et al., 2015), this would facilitate the much-needed transition toward an unbiased protection of the diversity of life. Thus, we urge journalists to renew their efforts toward objectivity and accuracy, which are best achieved by: i) consulting and interviewing experts; ii) referring to scientific literature, as well as to modern online resources led by expert arachnologists (e.g., the [@RecluseOrNot](#) and [@Arachno\\_Cosas](#) projects on Twitter); and iii) avoiding unmotivated sensationalism when describing biting events.

### **Future avenues of research**

We only scratched the surface of the media representation of spiders, leaving open several questions and avenues for research. The temporal span of our study mostly covered the advent of online journalism and the diffusion of social media. In recent years, social media

platforms have become an important battlefield for political debates (Hall, Tinati, & Jennings, 2018), as well as the primary digital environments where people inform themselves and frame their perception of the world (Weeks, Ardèvol-Abreu, & Gil de Zúñiga, 2015). In parallel, social media have emerged as the preferential channel through which traditional news are disseminated and discussed (Lee & Ma, 2012), with most newspapers now actively using Facebook and Twitter to spread their online contents more effectively (Ju, Jeong, & Chyi, 2014). Under this perspective, an interesting endeavour would be to compare our results with the media representation of spiders from before online access to newspaper was widespread, and how this may link to the change in their conservation status. Given the exponential rise in the volume of spider-related news we observed here (Figure 4a), and the pattern of sensationalistic news spread on social media (Figure 5), one might predict the issue to be less severe prior to the arrival of such a wide range of dissemination opportunities.

Importantly, this research exemplifies a methodological approach that is efficient and inexpensive, and thus can be reproduced – with minor adjustments – in other cases. To the best of our knowledge, there are few studies similar to this one and mostly focused on vertebrates (Bombieri et al., 2018; Nanni et al., 2020), that can be used for making comparisons. To bridge this gap, one could explore media representation of a broader selection of taxa, including animals that are not stigmatized in the same way (e.g., bees; Smith & Saunders, 2016), but also other feared and/or venomous animals (e.g., snakes; McNamee, 2001). A similar exercise would allow to compare if the levels of misinformation and sensationalism is the same across a broad spectrum of taxa, testing the prediction if a negative framing by the traditional and social media translates to a lower chance of being prioritized for conservation, and *vice versa*. Also, it would be worth to compare the representation of spiders across different social media platform, to explore the generality of the pattern and the reasons for divergences.

Finally, one may argue that the newspaper representation of spiders in Italy might represent only a very specific case. Thus, an interesting follow-up to this study would be to compare the quality of the Italian news with those in countries with either a greater number of species capable of causing medically significant species (e.g., South Africa, South America, and Australia) or no such species (e.g., North European countries). This information would allow to infer if biological and socio-economic factors affect the quality and sensationalism of the newspapers of a country, and how ultimately this correlates to the general conservation status of species.

## Conclusions

Fear of spiders is one of the most prevalent animal-related phobias in humans (Mammola et al., 2017) and thus, spider-related contents are an effective emotional trigger (Smith-Janik & Teachman, 2008). We have shown how some journalists are able to exploit arachnophobic sentiments, framing sensationalistic news capable of attracting substantial online attention. Sensationalistic news that dramatize and overstate the frequency of spiders “attacks” on

humans are also those which most attract social media. Through emotional contagion, this biased representation is spread online.

The persistence of arachnophobic sentiments in the society, fueled also by the media framing, has far-reaching implications. Not only it may result in lowering public tolerance for spiders and in leading to lower willingness for conservation and management efforts. It may also imply that less researchers and amateur naturalists will end up studying spiders compared to more charismatic taxa. In the long run, this may generate a vicious circle where research, conservation, and correct information about spiders will be progressively penalized. This problem may be particularly pervasive in Italy, given that the general culture regarding natural history is not as developed as in countries in Central and Northern Europe.

### **Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to Marco Colombo (<http://www.calosoma.it/en>) and Marco Bertolini (<https://www.flickr.com/photos/shunkamanitotanka/>) for kindly providing photos of spiders. Diego Fontaneto provided valuable suggestions. Special thanks are due to Stephen Cooper for proof-reading the English. We also thank two anonymous referees and the editors for constructive suggestions.

### **Authors' contributions**

SM framed the study, performed analyses, prepared figures, and wrote the first draft. SM, VN, PP, and MI managed data. All authors contributed to the writing and the revisions.

### **Data availability statement**

Data supporting this study are available in Figshare <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12593315.v1> (Mammola et al., 2020a)

### **Conflict of interest statement**

None declared.

### **LITERATURE CITED**

- Afshari, R. (2016). Bite like a spider, sting like a scorpion. *Nature*, 537(167). doi:10.1038/537167e
- Bartoń, K. (2019). MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.43.6. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>
- Bennett, R. G., & Vetter, R. S. (2004). An approach to spider bites. Erroneous attribution of dermonecrotic lesions to brown recluse or hobo spider bites in Canada. *Canadian Family Physician*, 50, 1098–1101.
- Berger, J., & Milkman, K. L. (2012). What makes online content viral? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49(2), 192–205. doi:10.1509/jmr.10.0353
- Bertone, M. A., Leong, M., Bayless, K. M., Malow, T. L. F., Dunn, R. R., & Trautwein, M. D. (2016). Arthropods of the great indoors: characterizing diversity inside urban and suburban homes. *PeerJ*, 4, e1582. doi:10.7717/peerj.1582

- Blasco-Moreno, A., Pérez-Casany, M., Puig, P., Morante, M., & Castells, E. (2019). What does a zero mean? Understanding false, random and structural zeros in ecology. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10(7), 949–959. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13185
- Bombieri, G., Nanni, V., Delgado, M. del M., Fedriani, J. M., López-Bao, J. V., Pedrini, P., & Penteriani, V. (2018). Content analysis of media reports on predator attacks on humans: Toward an understanding of human risk perception and predator acceptance. *BioScience*, 68(8), 577–584. doi:10.1093/biosci/biy072
- Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. R. (2004). *Multimodel inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*. (Springer-Verlag, Ed.), *Sociological Methods and Research*. New York. doi:10.1177/0049124104268644
- Canestrini, G., & Pavesi, P. (1868). Araneidi italiani. *Atti Della Società Italiana Di Scienze Naturali, Milano*, 11(3), 738–872.
- Cardoso, P., Barton, P. S., Birkhofer, K., Chichorro, F., Deacon, C., Fartmann, T., ... Samways, M. J. (2020). Scientists' warning to humanity on insect extinctions. *Biological Conservation*, 242, 108426. doi:10.1016/J.BIOCON.2020.108426
- Cavell, M. (2018). Arachnophobia and early english literature. In L. Ashe, P. Knox, D. Lawton, & W. Scase (Eds.), *New Medieval Literature* (pp. 1–44). Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Cotes, B., Gonzalez, M., Benitez, E., De Mas, E., Clemente-Orta, G., Campos, M., & Rodriguez, E. (2018). spider communities and biological control in native habitats surrounding greenhouses. *Insects*, 9(1). doi:10.3390/insects9010033
- Cushing, N., & Markwell, K. (2010). 'Watch out for these KILLERS!': Newspaper coverage of the Sydney funnel web spider and its impact on antivenom research. *Health and History*, 12(2), 79–96.
- Davey, G. C. L. (1994). The 'disgusting' spider: The role of disease and illness in the perpetuation of fear of spiders. *Society & Animals*, 2(1), 17–25.
- Davey, G. C. L., McDonald, A. S., Hirisave, U., Prabhu, G. G., Iwawaki, S., Jim, C. I., ... C. Reimann, B. (1998). A cross-cultural study of animal fears. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 36(7–8), 735–750. doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(98)00059-X
- Davies, T., Cowley, A., Bennie, J., Leyshon, C., Inger, R., Carter, H., ... Gaston, K. (2018). Popular interest in vertebrates does not reflect extinction risk and is associated with bias in conservation investment. *PLOS ONE*, 13(9), e0203694. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0203694>
- DeLoache, J. S., Pickard, M. B., & LoBue, V. (2010). How very young children think about animals. In P. McCardle, S. McCune, J. A. Griffin, & V. Maholmes (Eds.), *How animals affect us: Examining the influences of human–animal interaction on child development and human health* (p. 85–99). American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/12301-004
- Diaz, J. H., & Leblanc, K. E. (2007). Common spider bites. *American Family Physician*, 75(6), 869–873.
- Drijfhout, M., Kendal, D., & Green, P. T. (2020). Understanding the human dimensions of managing overabundant charismatic wildlife in Australia. *Biological Conservation*, 244, 108506. doi:10.1016/J.BIOCON.2020.108506
- Fournier, D. A., Skaug, H. J., Ancheta, J., Ianelli, J., Magnusson, A., Maunder, M. N., ... Sibert, J. (2012). AD Model Builder: Using automatic differentiation for statistical inference of highly parameterized complex nonlinear models. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 27, 233–249. doi:10.1080/10556788.2011.597854
- Frank, J., Johansson, M., & Flykt, A. (2015). Public attitude towards the implementation of management actions aimed at reducing human fear of brown bears and wolves. *Wildlife Biology*, 21, 122–130. doi:10.2981/wlb.13116
- Fukushima, C. S., Mammola, S., & Cardoso, P. (2020). Global wildlife trade permeates the Tree of Life. *Biological Conservation*, 247, 108503. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108503
- Gerber, D. L. J., Burton-Jeangros, C., & Dubied, A. (2011). Animals in the media: New boundaries of risk? *Health, Risk and Society*, 13(1), 17–30. doi:10.1080/13698575.2010.540646
- Gerdes, A. B. M., Uhl, G., & Alpers, G. W. (2009). Spiders are special: Fear and disgust evoked by pictures of arthropods. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30(1), 66–73. doi:10.1016/J.EVOLHUMBEHAV.2008.08.005

- Hathaway, R. S., Bryant, A. E. M., Draheim, M. M., Vinod, P., Limaye, S., & Athreya, V. (2017). From fear to understanding: Changes in media representations of leopard incidences after media awareness workshops in mumbai, India. *Journal of Urban Ecology*, 3(1), jux009. doi:10.1093/jue/jux009
- Hauke, T. J., & Herzig, V. (2017). Dangerous arachnids—Fake news or reality? *Toxicon*, 138, 173–183. doi:10.1016/J.TOXICON.2017.08.024
- Hawkins, D. M. (2004). The problem of overfitting. *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*, 44, 1–12. doi:10.1021/ci0342472
- Heim, M., Keerl, D., & Scheibel, T. (2009). Spider silk: From soluble protein to extraordinary fiber. *Angewandte Chemie - International Edition*, 48(20), 3584–3596. doi:10.1002/anie.200803341
- Hicks, J. R., & Stewart, W. P. (2018). Exploring potential components of wildlife-inspired awe. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 23(3), 293–295. doi:10.1080/10871209.2018.1419518
- Hinman, M. B., Jones, J. A., & Lewis, R. V. (2000). Synthetic spider silk: A modular fiber. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 18(9), 374–379. doi:10.1016/S0167-7799(00)01481-5
- Isbister, G. K., & Fan, H. W. (2011). Spider bite. *The Lancet*, 378, 2039–2047. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)62230-1
- Jacobs, M. H. (2009). Why do we like or dislike animals? *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 14(1), 1–11. doi:10.1080/10871200802545765
- Jacobs, M. H. (2012). Human emotions toward wildlife. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 17(1), 1–3. doi:10.1080/10871209.2012.653674
- Jambrina, C. U., Vacas, J. M., & Sánchez-Barbudo, M. (2010). Preservice teachers' conceptions about animals and particularly about spiders. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 8(2), 787–814.
- Jarić, I., Correia, R. A., Brook, B. W., Buettel, J. C., Courchamp, F., Di Minin, E., ... Roll, U. (2020). iEcology: Harnessing large online resources to generate ecological insights. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 35, 630–639. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.03.003
- Jones, S. (2006). A political ecology of wildlife conservation in Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, 33(109), 483–495. doi:10.1080/03056240601000911
- Ju, A., Jeong, S. H., & Chyi, H. I. (2014). Will Social Media Save Newspapers?: Examining the effectiveness of Facebook and Twitter as news platforms. *Journalism Practice*, 8, 1–17. doi:10.1080/17512786.2013.794022
- Kang, D., Pikhitsa, P. V., Choi, Y. W., Lee, C., Shin, S. S., Piao, L., ... Choi, M. (2014). Ultrasensitive mechanical crack-based sensor inspired by the spider sensory system. *Nature*, 516(7530), 222–226. doi:10.1038/nature14002
- Knight, A. J. (2008). 'Bats, snakes and spiders, Oh my!' How aesthetic and negativistic attitudes, and other concepts predict support for species protection. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28(1), 94–103. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2007.10.001
- Knopff, A. A., Knopff, K. H., & St. Clair, C. C. (2016). Tolerance for cougars diminished by high perception of risk. *Ecology and Society*, 21, 33. doi:10.5751/ES-08933-210433
- Kramer, A. D. I., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(24), 8788 LP – 8790. doi:10.1073/pnas.1320040111
- Langley, R. L. (2005). Animal-related fatalities in the United States—an update. *Wilderness & Environmental Medicine*, 16(2), 67–74. doi:https://doi.org/10.1580/1080-6032(2005)16[67:AFITUS]2.0.CO;2
- Leather, S. R. (2013). Institutional vertebratism hampers insect conservation generally; not just saproxylic beetle conservation. *Animal Conservation*, 16, 379–380. doi:10.1111/acv.12068
- Lemelin, R. H., & Yen, A. (2015). Human-spider entanglements: Understanding and managing the good, the bad, and the venomous. *Anthrozoös*, 28(2), 215–228. doi:10.1080/08927936.2015.11435398
- Mammola, S., Michalik, P., Hebets, E. A., & Isaia, M. (2017). Record breaking achievements by spiders and the scientists who study them. *PeerJ*, 5(10), e3972. doi:10.7717/peerj.3972



- Mammola, S., Nanni, V., Pantini, P., & Isaia, M. (2020a). Data for "Media framing of spiders may exacerbate arachnophobic sentiments". *Figshare* (dataset). doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.12593315.v1
- Mammola, S., Riccardi, N., Prié, V., Correia, R., Cardoso, P., Lopes-Lima, M., & Sousa, R. (2020b). Towards a taxonomically unbiased EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030. *BioRxiv*, 2020.07.06.189027. doi:10.1101/2020.07.06.189027
- McNamee, D. (2001). Tackling venomous snake bites worldwide. *The Lancet*, 357(9269), 1680. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(00)04868-6
- Merckelbach, H., Muris, P., & Schouten, E. (1996). Pathways to fear in spider phobic children. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 34(11–12), 935–938. doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(96)00052-6
- Michalko, R., Pekár, S., Dul'a, M., & Entling, M. H. (2019). Global patterns in the biocontrol efficacy of spiders: A meta-analysis. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 28(9), 1366–1378. doi:10.1111/geb.12927
- Michalko, R., Pekar, S., & Entling, M. H. (2019). An updated perspective on spiders as generalist predators in biological control. *OECOLOGIA*, 189(1), 21–36. doi:10.1007/s00442-018-4313-1
- Michalski, K., & Michalski, S. (2010). *Spider*. London, UK: Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Milano, F., Pantini, P., Mammola, S., & Isaia, M. (2017). La conservazione dell'araneofauna in Italia e in Europa [Spider conservation in Italy and Europe]. *Atti Accademia Nazionale Italiana Di Entomologia*, 65, 91–103.
- Moore, S. J., Leung, C. L., Norton, H. K., & Cochran, J. R. (2013). Engineering agatoxin, a cystine-knot peptide from spider venom, as a molecular probe for in vivo tumor imaging. *PLOS ONE*, 8(4), e60498. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0060498
- Nanni, V., Caprio, E., Bombieri, G., Schiaparelli, S., Chiorri, C., Mammola, S., ... Penteriani, V. (2020). Social media and large carnivores: Sharing biased news on attacks on humans. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 8, 71. doi:10.3389/fevo.2020.00071
- Nentwig, W., Blick, T., Bosmans, R., Gloor, D., Hänggi, A., & Kropf, C. (2020). Araneae - Spider of Europe. Version 07.2020. doi:10.24436/1
- Nentwig, W., Gnädinger, M., Fuchs, J., & Ceschi, A. (2013). A two year study of verified spider bites in Switzerland and a review of the European spider bite literature. *Toxicon*, 73, 104–110. doi:10.1016/j.toxicon.2013.07.010
- Nentwig, W., & Kuhn-Nentwig, L. (2013). Spider venoms potentially lethal to humans. In W. Nentwig (Eds.), *Spider Ecophysiology* (pp. 253–264). Heidelberg: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-33989-9\_19
- Nentwig, W., Pantini, P., & Vetter, R. S. (2017). Distribution and medical aspects of *Loxosceles rufescens*, one of the most invasive spiders of the world (Araneae: Sicariidae). *Toxicon*, 132, 19–28. doi:10.1016/j.toxicon.2017.04.007
- Nyffeler, M., & Birkhofer, K. (2017). An estimated 400–800 million tons of prey are annually killed by the global spider community. *The Science of Nature*, 104(3), 30. doi:10.1007/s00114-017-1440-1
- Pantini, P., & Isaia, M. (2019). Araneae.it: the online Catalog of Italian spiders, with addenda on other Arachnid Orders occurring in Italy (Arachnida: Araneae, Opiliones, Palpigradi, Pseudoscorpionida, Scorpiones, Solifugae). Online at [www.araneae.it](http://www.araneae.it), accessed on {26 April 2020}. *Fragmenta Entomologica*, 52(2), 127–152. doi:10.4081/fe.2019.374
- Papworth, S. K., Nghiem, T. P. L., Chimalakonda, D., Posa, M. R. C., Wijedasa, L. S., Bickford, D., & Carrasco, L. R. (2015). Quantifying the role of online news in linking conservation research to Facebook and Twitter. *Conservation Biology*, 29(3), 825–833. doi:10.1111/cobi.12455
- Pepe, R. (2005). Basi zoologiche-naturalistiche del tarantismo nel Salento. *Thalassia Salentina*, 27(2004), 47–62.
- Pezzi, M., Giglio, A. M., Scozzafava, A., Filippelli, O., Serafino, G., & Verre, M. (2016). Spider bite: A rare case of acute necrotic arachnidism with rapid and fatal evolution. *Case Reports in Emergency Medicine*, 2016, 7640789. doi:10.1155/2016/7640789
- Planas, E., Saupe, E. E., Lima-Ribeiro, M. S., Peterson, A. T., & Ribera, C. (2014). Ecological niche and phylogeography elucidate complex biogeographic patterns in *Loxosceles rufescens* (Araneae, Sicariidae) in the Mediterranean Basin. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 14. doi:10.1186/s12862-014-0195-y

- Prokop, P., & Tunnicliffe, S. D. (2008). 'Disgusting' animals: Primary school children's attitudes and myths of bats and spiders. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 4(2), 87–97. doi:10.12973/ejmste/75309
- R Core Team. (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Rogers, H., Hille Ris Lambers, J., Miller, R., & Tewksbury, J. J. (2012). 'Natural experiment' demonstrates top-down control of spiders by birds on a landscape level. *PLOS ONE*, 7(9), e43446. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0043446
- Saez, N. J., Senff, S., Jensen, J. E., Er, S. Y., Herzig, V., Rash, L. D., & King, G. F. (2010). Spider-venom peptides as therapeutics. *Toxins*, 2(12), 2851–2871. doi:10.3390/toxins2122851
- Samways, M. J., Barton, P. S., Birkhofer, K., Chichorro, F., Deacon, C., Fartmann, T., ... Cardoso, P. (2020). Solutions for humanity on how to conserve insects. *Biological Conservation*, 242, 108427. doi:10.1016/J.BIOCON.2020.108427
- Savage, I. (2013). Comparing the fatality risks in United States transportation across modes and over time. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 43, 9–22. doi:10.1016/j.retrec.2012.12.011
- Simaika, J. P., & Samways, M. J. (2018). Insect conservation psychology. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 22(3), 635–642. doi:10.1007/s10841-018-0047-y
- Singh, S. (2009). Governing anti-conservation sentiments: Forest politics in Laos. *Human Ecology*, 37(6), 749. doi:10.1007/s10745-009-9276-8
- Slovic, P., & Peters, E. (2006). Risk perception and affect. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 322–325. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00461.x
- Smith-Janik, S. B., & Teachman, B. A. (2008). Impact of priming on explicit memory in spider fear. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 32(2), 291–302. doi:10.1007/s10608-007-9122-5
- Smith, T. J., & Saunders, M. E. (2016). Honey bees: The queens of mass media, despite minority rule among insect pollinators. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 9(5), 384–390. doi:10.1111/icad.12178
- Straka, T. M., Miller, K. K., & Jacobs, M. H. (2020). Understanding the acceptability of wolf management actions: roles of cognition and emotion. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 25(1), 33–46. doi:10.1080/10871209.2019.1680774
- Strommen, E. (1995). Lions and tigers and bears, oh my! children's conceptions of forests and their inhabitants. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 32(7), 683–698. doi:10.1002/tea.3660320704
- Stuber, M., & Nentwig, W. (2016). How informative are case studies of spider bites in the medical literature? *Toxicon*, 114, 40–44. doi:10.1016/j.toxicon.2016.02.023
- Suchard, J. R. (2011). 'Spider bite' lesions are usually diagnosed as skin and soft-tissue infections. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 41(5), 473–481. doi:10.1016/j.jemermed.2009.09.014
- Taucare-Rios, A., Nentwig, W., Bizama, G., & Bustamante, R. O. (2018). Matching global and regional distribution models of the recluse spider *Loxosceles rufescens*: to what extent do these reflect niche conservatism? *MEDICAL AND VETERINARY ENTOMOLOGY*, 32(4), 490–496. doi:10.1111/mve.12311
- Turnbull, A. L. (1973). Ecology of the true spiders (Araneomorphae). *Annual Review of Entomology*, 18(1), 305–348. doi:10.1146/annurev.en.18.010173.001513
- US District Court. Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama No. 19-10940, Pub. L. No. D.C. Docket No. 4:18-cv-01509-ACA, 1 (2020). Alabama.
- Vetter, R. S. (2004). Myths about spider envenomations and necrotic skin lesions. *Lancet*, 364, 484–485. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(04)16824-4
- Vetter, R. S., Hinkle, N. C., & Ames, L. M. (2009). Distribution of the brown recluse spider (Araneae: Sicariidae) in Georgia with comparison to poison center reports of envenomations. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 46(1), 15–20. doi:10.1603/033.046.0103
- Vetter, R. S., & Isbister, G. K. (2008). Medical aspects of spider bites. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 53, 409–429. doi:10.1146/annurev.ento.53.103106.093503

- Vetter, R. S., Warrell, D. A., Isbister, G. K., White, J., Currie, B. J., & Bush, S. P. (2005). Spider bites: Addressing mythology and poor evidence. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 72(4), 361–364. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2005.72.361
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146–1151. doi:10.1126/science.aap9559
- White, J. (2003). Debunking spider bite myths. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 179(4), 180–181. doi:10.5694/j.1326-5377.2003.tb05493.x
- Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Wilson, R. E., Gosling, S. D., & Graham, L. T. (2012). A review of Facebook research in the social sciences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(3), 203–220. doi:10.1177/1745691612442904
- World Spider Catalog. (2020). World Spider Catalog. Version 20.5. doi:10.24436/2
- Zainal Abidin, Z. A., & Jacobs, M. (2019). Relationships between valence towards wildlife and wildlife value orientations. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 49, 63–68. doi:10.1016/J.JNC.2019.02.007
- Zuur, A. F., & Ieno, E. N. (2016). A protocol for conducting and presenting results of regression-type analyses. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(6), 636–645. doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12577

## TABLE, BOX ITEMS, AND FIGURES CAPTIONS

**Table 1. Result of model selection and estimated regression parameters.** Estimated regression parameters (Estimated  $\beta \pm \text{s.e.}$ ) for fixed terms are given only for the selected model (Share ~ Year + Sensationalism).

Competing models	Estimated $\beta \pm \text{s.e.}$	p	df	AIC	$\Delta\text{AIC}$	$w_i$
Intercept	-2688.36 $\pm$ 434.44	-	6	3057.76	0.0	0.414
Year	1.33 $\pm$ 0.22	5.6 e <sup>-10</sup>				
Sensationalism	1.15 $\pm$ 0.50	0.02				
Share ~ Circulation + Year + Sensationalism	-	-	7	3059.16	1.40	0.206
Share ~ Circulation + Year + Sensationalism + Expert opinion	-	-	8	3059.72	1.96	0.156
Share ~ Circulation + Year + Sensationalism + Figure (bite) + Expert opinion	-	-	9	3060.40	2.64	0.111
Share ~ Circulation + Year + Sensationalism + Figure (species) + Figure (bite) + Expert opinion	-	-	10	3061.48	3.72	0.065
Share ~ Circulation + Year + Sensationalism + Species + Figure (species) + Figure (bite) + Expert opinion	-	-	11	3063.16	5.40	0.028
Share ~ Event type + Circulation + Year + Sensationalism + Species + Figure (species) + Figure (bite) + Expert opinion	-	-	12	3064.68	6.92	0.013

Share ~ Event type + Circulation + Year + Month + Month <sup>2</sup> + Sensationalism + Species + Figure (species) + Figure (bite) + Expert opinion	-	-	14	3065.66	7.90	0.008
--	---	---	----	---------	------	-------


AIC= Aikake Information Criterion;  $\Delta AIC$ = (AIC of the model – AIC of the best model); df= Degrees of freedom;  $p$ =  $p$ -value;  $w_i$ = Aikake weights.

### Box 1. Spiders generally perceived as dangerous in Italy.

There are only a handful of species that can potentially cause harmful bites in Italy. Based on our experience as consultants, we noticed that four species are frequently reported by people: the yellow sac spider *Cheiracanthium puncturium* (Villers, 1789) (Cheiracanthiidae), the Mediterranean black widow *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* (Theridiidae) (Rossi, 1790), the Mediterranean recluse *Loxosceles rufescens* (Sicariidae) (Dufour, 1820), and the false wolf spider *Zoropsis spinimana* (Dufour, 1820) (Zoropsidae). Among those, only *La. tredecimguttatus* and *Lo. rufescens* are responsible for medically important clinical syndromes, namely latrodectism/ and loxoscelism (see Isbister & Fan, 2011 for a description of symptoms).

*Loxosceles rufescens* is native to the Mediterranean basin (Planas, Saupe, Lima-Ribeiro, Peterson, & Ribera, 2014), but has been introduced to many areas of the world where it is considered an important invasive species (Nentwig et al., 2017; Taucare-Rios, Nentwig, Bizama, & Bustamante, 2018). The Mediterranean recluse is a rather common inhabitant of natural and in-door habitats in Italy and thus, it seems likely that it has been coexisting with humans for centuries. Indeed, the species has been known in Italy since the second half of the XIX century, when the first catalogue on Italian spiders was published (Canestrini & Pavesi, 1868). According to scientific literature on Italian spiders (Pantini & Isaia, 2019), records of *Lo. rufescens* in indoor habitats have been increasing since 2000, with only one record before 1900, four between 1960 and 2000, and seven after 2000.

*Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* was described based on specimens collected in Volterra (Tuscany). The species is distributed across a wide area in the Palearctic region, from the Mediterranean basin to Ukraine, Caucasus, Central Asia, and China (World Spider Catalog, 2020). In Italy, as well as in most other countries, the Mediterranean black widow is preferably found in ruderal areas of agricultural land and, just like *Lo. rufescens*, has been living close to humans for centuries. However, according to scientific literature on Italian spiders (Pantini & Isaia, 2019), most records of this species refer to natural or semi-natural (agricultural) habitats and only in one case (Pepe, 2005) has the species been reported in synanthropic habitats.



**Box figure.** a) *Cheiracanthium puncturium* b) *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* c) *Loxosceles rufescens* d) *Zoropsis spinimana*. Photo credit: a–c) Marco Colombo; d) Marco Bertolini.

### FIGURE CAPTIONS

**Figure 1. Infographic illustrating the study design and summary statistics:** **a)** Flowchart of the general methodology for retrieving media reports and mining relevant information. **b)** Survey summary statistics.

**Figure 2. Content of media reports:** **a)** Type of event covered by media reports focusing on *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus*, *Loxosceles rufescens*, and other species. **b)** Logarithm of total number of shares on Facebook (the grey dots are jittered observed values, whereas the boxplots summarize median, quantiles, and range). **c)** Frequency of species photographs in media reports. **d)** Frequency of bite photographs in media reports. **e)** Frequency of expert consultancy in media reports. **f)** Frequency of sensationalistic versus non-sensationalistic media reports.

**Figure 3. Quality of media reports:** **a)** Total number of error for media reports focusing on *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus*, *Loxosceles rufescens*, and other species. **b)** Errors related to the photographs of spiders included in the media reports. **c)** Errors related to the taxonomy of spiders. **d)** Errors related to the effect of the venom of spiders. **e)** Errors related to the anatomy of spiders.

**Figure 4. Temporal distribution of media reports:** The cumulative curves for media reports referring to *Latrodectus tredecimguttatus* and *Loxosceles rufescens* are estimated with a kernel density. **a)** Annual distribution of media reports between 2010 and 2019. Few remarks are highlighted on the x-axis (see main text for details). **b)** Monthly distribution of media reports (cumulative of all years).

**Figure 5. Factors driving the spreading of media reports on social media:** The results are based on the most appropriate generalised linear mixed model (see Table 1 for model selection and estimated regression parameters). **a)** Predicted relationship between the number of Facebook shares and the year of publication of the media report (2010–2019). To generate the prediction, the effect of all factorial terms was summed to the intercept. **b)** Boxplots showing the difference between number of Facebook shares in neutral versus sensationalistic media reports.